

REMARKS

Claims 106-108 are added herein. Claims 1-108 now remain pending in the application, with claims 16-32, 47-57 and 74-105 withdrawn from consideration because of a restriction requirement.

Restriction

The Applicants elected claims 1-15, 33-46 and 58-73 with a Response to Restriction Requirement filed March 25, 2004. The Applicants have not canceled the non-elected claims. Thus, claims 1-108 remain pending in the subject application.

Claims 1-15, 33-46 and 58-73 over Greer in view of AAPA

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 14, 33-38, 40, 41, 45, 58-65, 67, 68 and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,247,048 to Greer et al. ("Greer"), with claims 8, 11-13, 15, 39, 42-44, 46, 66, 69-71 and 73 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Official Notice ("ON"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-15, 33-46 and 58-73 recite reformatting content in accordance with a screen associated with a mobile device the content is viewable on.

Greer appears to disclose a system and method for transcoding character sets between Internet hosts and thin client devices over data networks (Abstract). A character set transcoder transcodes a response from an Internet server into a character set used by a mobile computing device (Greer, col. 7, lines 10-19).

Greer's invention is directed toward making sure a mobile computing device that is able to view only a limited character set receives information with that character set when accessing the Internet. Greer's reformatting a character set of content is **NOT** dependent on the screen the content is viewable on, as recited by claims 1-15, 33-36 and 58-73.

The Examiner relies on Official Notice to disclose defining a mobile device by a manufacturer and model, and providing a secure socket layer connection (Office Action, page 6).

Even with taking Official Notice, Greer in view of ON fails to disclose, teach or suggest reformatting content in accordance with a screen associated with a mobile device the content is viewable on, as recited by claims 1-15, 33-46 and 58-73.

A benefit of reformatting content in accordance with a screen the content will be viewable on for a mobile device is, e.g., making the content easier to view on a small display. Typically, mobile devices have much smaller displays than more stationary devices such as a personal computer. With such small displays, the mobile devices can not conveniently display such content as HTML pages. Reforming such content to more easily be viewed on a small screen increases the usefulness of mobile devices. The prior art fails to disclose or suggest such benefits.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-15, 33-46 and 58-73 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307

WHB/df